DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 024 802 VT 006 686

By- Johnson, Mildred; And Others

Summary of Pilot Study to Determine Criteria for Selection and Preparation of Teachers, Selection of Participants, and Organization of High School Home Economics Programs with Occupational Emphasis. Parts I, II & III. Research Series in Occupational Education.

North Carolina Research Coordinating Unit in Occupational Education, Raleigh.; North Carolina Univ., Greensboro. School of Home Economics.; North Carolina Univ., Raleigh. State Univ. School of Education.

Pub Date 68

Note- 77p.

EDRS Price MF-$0.50 HC-$3.95

Descriptors- *Admission Criteria, Course Organization, Criteria, High Schools, National Surveys, *Occupational Home Economics, *Organization, Program Attitudes, Program Planning, Questionnaires, Student Characteristics, Teacher Characteristics, *Teacher Education, *Teacher Selection

An investigation of three phases of the high school occupational home economics program was conducted to provide guidelines for strengthening vocational programs. Questionnaires were sent to 110 randomly selected teachers of occupational home economics in 47 states, with 76.4 percent response to phase I, 79 percent response to phase II, 73.6 percent response to phase III. Phase I studied student selection criteria currently in use. Major findings were: (1) Most occupational home economics programs were in large schools, (2) Student interest and teacher encouragement were major selection factors, (3) Only 24.6 percent pre-tested students, (4) About half required parental consent for enrollment, and (5) 72 percent of the enrollees had previous home economics classes. Phase II investigated organizational criteria, program provisions, problems, and grading. The schools reported use of surveys to determine need, advisory councils, employer interviews, planned observations, and supervised work experience. Seventy-seven percent based grades on both classroom and work experience. Phase III, an investigation of teacher selection, preparation and experience, revealed that most teachers sampled had a baccalaureate degree, at least five years teaching experience, plus other work experience and were trained to teach home economics. The research instruments are included in the document. (FP)

ED0 24802

SUMMARY OF PILOT STUDY TO DETERMINE CRITERIA FOR SELECTION AND PREPARATION OF TEACHERS, SELECTION OF PARTICIPANTS, AND ORGANIZATION OF HIGH SCHOOL HOME ECONOMICS PROGRAMS WITH OCCUPATIONAL EMPHASIS

PART I

Mildred Johnson—Louise Lowe—Barbara Wise

PARTS II & III

Mildred Johnson—Louise Lowe

1968

RESEARCH SERIES IN OCCUPATIONAL EDUCATION

NORTH CAROLINA RESEARCH COORDINATING UNIT IN OCCUPATIONAL EDUCATION

In Cooperation With

DEPARTMENT OF HOME ECONOMICS EDUCATION

SCHOOL OF HOME ECONOMICS

THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA AT GREENSBORO

SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

NORTH CAROLINA STATE UNIVERSITY AT RALEIGH

RALEIGH, NORTH CAROLINA

VT006686

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

SUMMARY OF PILOT STUDY TO DETERMINE CRITERIA FOR SELECTION AND PREPARATION OF TEACHERS, SELECTION OF PARTICIPANTS, AND ORGANIZATION OF HIGH SCHOOL HOME ECONOMICS PROGRAMS WITH OCCUPATIONAL EMPHASIS.

Part I,
Mildred Johnson and others - Louise Lowe - Barbara Wise

Parts II & III,
Mildred Johnson, Louise Lowe.

Research Series in Occupational Education - No. 10
A report of research conducted by Dr. Mildred B. Johnson, Louise Lowe and Barbara Wise, Department of Home Economics Education, University of North Carolina-Greensboro. Publication and dissemination of research findings is in cooperation with the North Carolina Research Coordinating Unit in Occupational Education.

VT 6686

M E M O R A N D U M

TO: The ERIC Clearinghouse on Vocational and Technical Education
The Ohio State University
980 Kinnear Road
Columbus, Ohio 43212

FROM: (Person) Joe R. Clary, Director (Agency) N. C. Research Coordinating Unit

(Address) Box 5312, Raleigh, North Carolina 27607

DATE: September 6, 1968

RE: (Author, Title, Publisher, Date) Johnson, M and others. Summary of Pilot Study to Determine Criteria for Selection and Preparation of Teachers, Selection of Participants, and Organization of High School Home Economics Programs with Occupational Emphasis;
North Carolina RCU, U. of N.C. at Greensboro, N.C. State U.; 1968.

Supplementary Information on Instructional Material

Provide information below which is not included in the publication. Mark N/A in each blank for which information is not available or not applicable. Mark P when information is included in the publication. See reverse side for further instructions.

(1) Source of Available Copies:
Agency N. C. Research Coordinating Unit
Address Box 5312, Raleigh, N. C. 27607
Limitation on Available Copies 1 Price/Unit free
(quantity prices) N/A

(2) Means Used to Develop Material:
Development Group P
Level of Group P
Method of Design, Testing, and Trial P

(3) Utilization of Material:
Appropriate School Setting P
Type of Program P
Occupational Focus P
Geographic Adaptability P
Uses of Material P
Users of Material P

(4) Requirements for Using Material:
Teacher Competency P
Student Selection Criteria P
Time Allotment P

Supplemental Media --
Necessary N/A
Desirable N/A (Check Which)

Describe N/A

Source (agency) N/A
(address)

FOREWORD

The North Carolina Research Coordinating Unit in Occupational Education is pleased to have the opportunity of disseminating this report of a recent study by Dr. Mildred B. Johnson, Louise Lowe and Barbara Wise, Department of Home Economics Education, University of North Carolina - Greensboro.

We are indeed grateful to Dr. Johnson, Miss Lowe, Mrs. Wise and the School of Home Economics at the University of North Carolina - Greensboro for allowing us the privilege of disseminating this summary of the study.

This publication and others to follow are a result of the partial fulfillment of the commitment of the North Carolina Research Coordinating Unit to:

(a) Stimulate research in occupational education.

(b) Identify problems for research.

(c) Develop a system by which national, state, and local data may be organized and made available.

(d) Maintain communication between people who are working in occupational education and research workers.

(e) Assist in conducting training programs on activities involved in the research-action continuum.

(f) Provide consultant services in state, local, and area research developmental activities.

Joe R. Clary
Director

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE

INTRODUCTION 1

The Problem 2

Study Design 3

Limitations 4

PART I. PROCEDURES FOR SELECTION OF PARTICIPANTS IN HIGH SCHOOL HOME ECONOMICS PROGRAMS WITH OCCUPATIONAL EMPHASIS

Discussion and Analysis of Data 6

Major Findings 19

Implications 22

PART II. PROGRAM ORGANIZATION FOR HOME ECONOMICS PROGRAMS WITH OCCUPATIONAL EMPHASIS

Discussion and Analysis of Data 25

Major Findings 33

Implications 37

PART III. TEACHERS SELECTION, PREPARATION, AND EXPERIENCE FOR HOME ECONOMICS PROGRAMS WITH OCCUPATIONAL EMPHASIS

Discussion and Analysis of Data 42

Major Findings 50

Implications 54

APPENDICES 58

BIBLIOGRAPHY 69

LIST OF TABLES

TABLES PAGE

PART I.

1. Percentage of Programs in Various Size Schools 7

2. Methods Used in Selecting Participants 8

3. Number Using Various Kinds of Background Information About Students 10

4. Number Using Various Standardized Tests 11

5. Home Economics Background of Students Enrolled in Courses with Occupational Emphasis (1965-66) 13

6. Ability Levels of Student Given Primary Consideration in Selection Procedures 15

7. Type of Student Enrolled and the Percentage of Each Ability Level 16

8. Number of Teachers Recommending Age Level for Students in Home Economics Courses with Occupational Emphasis 16

PART II.

1. Methods Used to Determine the Need for Home Economics Courses with Occupational Emphasis 26

2. Number of Members That Comprise Advisory Committees 27

3. Methods Used to Determine the Demands for Employees with Home Economics Knowledge and Skills 28

4. Persons Involved in Planning the Curriculum for Home Economics Programs with Occupational Emphasis 29

5. Program Provisions for Home Economics Courses with Occupational Emphasis 30

PART III.

1. Educational Preparation of Persons Teaching Home Economics Programs with Occupational Emphasis 43

2. Number of Persons and Area of Background Preparation 44

3. Number of Classes Taught Per Day 45

4. Average Number of Students Per Home Economics Class 46

One of the important goals of the school today is to provide students with challenging and stimulating preparatory experiences that will enable them to meet the demands of today's accelerating and changing society. Providing students with the kind of education that will enable them to meet the current demands of daily living has been one of the pertinent problems encountered by school administrators. It must be recognized that adequate preparation is essential if the students are to meet their obligations to society, make maximum contributions to the society of which they are members, and develop their potential as individuals to the fullest extent.

A question arises as to whether education can meet the occupational need of the people. The purpose of vocational education, to prepare individuals to engage successfully in a socially useful occupation, implies that the individual will be provided adequate education for the development of skills, attitudes, and knowledge to the extent that he may enter or make progress in his chosen vocation.

Since the passage of the Vocational Act of 1963, the first permanent legislation in the field of vocational education since the passage of the George-Barden Act of 1946, programs in home economics education to prepare youth and adults for employment have become a reality. In a relatively short period of time programs with occupational emphasis at the high school level were developed. With this new direction for program development in home economics, numerous problems were created. These problems have been evident at the local, state,

and national level as the programs have and are being put into effect. Teacher educators are particularly concerned about their role in preparing teachers at the pre- and in-service level, for planning and teaching occupational courses at the high school level. School personnel who are involved in planning for and the teaching of occupational courses at the high school level have expressed concern about all phases of the program.

The Problem

Little information has been available for those concerned with providing occupational education opportunities through which young people could achieve the economic security and social well-being as members of society. Thus, it seemed apparent that a study should be made to investigate three phases of the high school home economics program with occupational emphasis and to make recommendations that could contribute to the strengthening of such vocational programs.

The purposes of this study were three-fold. They were to determine the criteria currently used for:

1. selection of participants for high school home economics courses with occupational emphasis
2. selection and preparation of teachers (and the kind of training preparation) for teaching courses with occupational emphasis
3. organization of programs with occupational emphasis.

Study Design

A letter was directed to the state supervisors of home economics in each of the fifty states and the District of Columbia to determine the number of home economics programs with occupational emphasis being offered in that particular state during the 1965-66 school year. The supervisor of each state and the District of Columbia was requested to list the names and addresses of persons presently teaching such courses in the home economics curriculum. Using a table of random numbers, 110 teachers were chosen from the combined lists of names for the study.

Three questionnaires were developed, one related to each phase of the study. These were used as a means of obtaining information related to the purposes of this study. A cover letter explaining the purposes of the study and the questionnaires were mailed to each teacher included in the sample. Two follow-up letters were sent to encourage the teachers to return the completed questionnaire. Eighty-four teachers, 76.4 per cent of the sample drawn returned the questionnaire concerning selection of participants for programs with occupational emphasis. Three of the eighty-four questionnaires returned were not completed. Eighty-seven teachers, 79 per cent of the sample drawn returned the questionnaires concerning teacher selection, preparation, and experience and program organization. Six of the eighty-seven questionnaires were not completed. Therefore, the information from eighty-one questionnaires, 73.6 per cent of the sample selected, provided the data upon which the analysis and discussion

are based. The data obtained from each questionnaire were analyzed descriptively.

Limitations

This study was limited to a random sample drawn from the list of names of home economics teachers who were responsible for instruction in courses with an occupational emphasis during the 1965-1966 school year. The list of names was obtained from forty-seven of the fifty-one supervisors in the United States.

The discussion, analysis of data, major findings, and implications will be presented separately for each phase of this study.

PROCEDURES FOR SELECTION OF PARTICIPANTS IN HIGH SCHOOL HOME ECONOMICS PROGRAMS WITH OCCUPATIONAL EMPHASIS

Part I

Mildred Johnson
Louise Lowe
Barbara Wise

PROCEDURES FOR SELECTION OF PARTICIPANTS IN HIGH SCHOOL HOME ECONOMICS PROGRAMS WITH OCCUPATIONAL EMPHASIS

The purposes of this phase of the study were to: (1) determine the criteria currently used for selection of participants in high school home economics courses with occupational emphasis; (2) determine if there was an apparent need to improve procedures for the selection of participants in high school home economics occupational courses; and (3) summarize findings that could be of value to those concerned with the various aspects of programs with occupational emphasis at the secondary level.

Discussion and Analysis of Data

A questionnaire concerning the selection of participants for home economics programs with occupational emphasis was developed and mailed to 110 home economics teachers (Appendix A).

Each teacher responded to two questions concerning the type and size of school in which she was teaching and fourteen questions concerning procedures used in selecting participants for home economics programs with occupational emphasis. These responses were considered representative of the procedures being used during the 1965-66 school year. Each item on the questionnaire was analyzed descriptively.

Information concerning the type of school where programs were in operation was not available prior to drawing the sample for the study. The teachers were asked to indicate whether the school in which they were teaching was urban or rural. Based on the data collected,

approximately 49.4 per cent taught in an urban setting. About one-third, 32.1 per cent, taught in rural schools and slightly over 14.8 per cent stated they were in settings not considered either strictly urban or rural. There was no response on 3.7 per cent of the eighty-one questionnaires returned.

The size of schools offering courses in home economics with occupational emphasis falls into one of four categories (Table 1).

TABLE 1

PERCENTAGE OF PROGRAMS IN VARIOUS SIZE SCHOOLS

Size of School	Per Cent
Less than 300 students	13.6
300 to 500 students	11.1
500 to 1000 students	22.2
Over 1000 students	48.1
No response	4.9

The largest proportion of courses were offered in schools with an enrollment of over one thousand students.

Teachers were asked to check the methods used in selecting students for occupational programs. Frequently more than one method was used in selecting students. Responses indicate that student interest plays an important role in the determination of participants for the course (Table 2). Numerous methods other than those listed in the questionnaire were cited by respondents. Several teachers indicated the use of some type of application blank. When students made application for a

course with occupational emphasis in a related area of the home economics curriculum, it appeared that important consideration was given to interest in pursuing an occupation in the area for which the student was receiving training, as well as age, and grade level. One respondent replied that the applicants who were free to work in the afternoons received thoughtful attention. Home economics teachers going into classes and discussing the requirements of the course was another medium used to acquaint students with the course. One teacher thought that visiting the student's home and discussing the program with the enrollee and parents was important. Teachers believed it their responsibility to acquaint participants with course requirements.

TABLE 2

METHODS USED IN SELECTING PARTICIPANTS

Method of Selection	Number	Per Cent
Interview	46	56.8
Interest	52	64.2
Registration	32	39.5
Tests	8	9.9
Recommendations	22	27.2

If an interview were used in selecting participants for training programs with occupational emphasis, 58.0 per cent of the respondents indicated that the home economics teacher was one of those comprising the interviewing committee. The guidance counselor was among those serving on the interviewing committee in 40.7 per cent of the respondents'

schools. The principal and assistant principal were among those serving on interviewing committees in 13.6 per cent of the respondents' schools. Only 6.2 per cent of the teachers checked a response indicating that the interviewing committee included either the homeroom teacher, dean of girls, or home economics supervisor. An occupational teacher training students for nursing aides thought it appropriate that the interviewing committee include a nurse. Other replies indicated that a representative from either the local employment agency or a local director of vocational education had been included on the interview committee.

Of the eighty-one teachers participating in this study, sixty-three indicated that the home economics teacher played the most important role in encouraging student enrollment. Thirty-five respondents cited the guidance counselor as being the one responsible for encouraging students to enroll. Ten teachers indicated that the principal was a key figure in encouraging students to enroll in home economics courses emphasizing occupational training. Only one respondent believed that the state supervisor had played a part in encouraging students to enroll in such courses. Two teachers stated that the advisory council members in their particular school had encouraged students to enroll. One of the teachers commented that publicity given through the news media had influenced students to enroll in such courses. The findings show that the interest of the students also had been an important factor in enrollment.

Teachers found various kinds of information about the student to be useful. Approximately one-fourth of the teachers indicated that they had information available prior to the time the student enrolled in their classes. In most schools, permanent records provided information pertaining to the student's academic ability, standardized test scores, and ratings of personality traits. Even though this information was available prior to the time the student enrolled in such courses, the questionnaire did not reveal how many teachers had made use of this information.

TABLE 3

NUMBER USING VARIOUS KINDS OF BACKGROUND INFORMATION ABOUT STUDENTS

Kinds of Information	Number
Interests and Aptitudes	63
Family Background	43
Ratings of Personal Traits	37
Academic Record	29
Standardized Test Scores	13

Fewer teachers responded to the question asking if the applicants had been given a standardized test before being accepted in courses with occupational emphasis. Twenty respondents checked one or more of the three choices.

TABLE 4

NUMBER USING VARIOUS STANDARDIZED TESTS

Test	Number
Aptitude	12
Vocational Interest	12
I. Q.	8

Twelve of the teachers checked that the test given had proved satisfactory.

Some of the I. Q. tests given the applicants were listed as Metropolitan Achievement, Otis Quick Scoring, and Stanford Achievement. Two of the teachers indicated that they had developed vocational interest tests, including a pre-test of knowledge pertinent to the course. The GATB Test had been used by two respondents. The Kuder Preference Test had been used in one school situation offering home economics courses with occupational emphasis while the Edwards Personality Test had been used in another school. There were two indications that a test had been administered by the employment agency. Still another response revealed that the applicants were required to provide necessary health data including a physical examination and a blood test prior to enrolling in the course.

Only twenty-six of the teachers who returned the questionnaire indicated that some type of personal data sheet had been used prior to registration to secure helpful information about the qualifications of the student. On the contrary, forty-eight teachers responded in

the negative. Eighteen respondents forwarded copies of either application blanks or personal data sheet to the investigator. A summary of the information requested in these application or registration forms included: family background, personal data (some forms consisted of separate personality tests and rating sheets for evaluation of personal qualities, interests and skills), academic rating, participation in extra curricular activities, job experience, occupational interest choices and reasons for enrolling in the course, condition of health and physical handicaps, character and ability references. Seldom was a record of attendance requested in the course registration forms.

The consent of a parent or a guardian was required by 41.9 per cent of the respondents before the applicant was accepted for the program. More than half of the respondents, 54.3 per cent, indicated that such consent was not required. Although 2.5 per cent of the eighty-one teachers participating in the study replied that such consent was not necessary, they revealed that parents had been informed about course requirements. The remaining respondents indicated that consent from home was necessary before the student could participate in observation or work experience.

The question seeking information relative to the number of students who have had courses in home economics prior to enrolling in the current course was answered explicitly by fifty-three persons. From the number reporting, 961 students had had previous training in home economics. The other twenty-eight respondents indicated by a check mark or with percentages those who had previously been enrolled in home

economics courses. The home economics background of students enrolled in courses with occupational emphasis is presented in the following table:

TABLE 5

HOME ECONOMICS BACKGROUND OF STUDENTS ENROLLED IN COURSES WITH OCCUPATIONAL EMPHASIS (1965-66)

Home Economics	Per Cent
No Economics	27.4
1 Semester	3.2
1 Year	32.5
2 Years	21.1
More than 2 Years	15.7

The majority of the respondents, 86.4 per cent, indicated that it was helpful for students to have had some home economics prior to enrolling in courses with an occupational emphasis. Only 6.2 per cent of the answers revealed that teachers did not consider it helpful for students to have had some home economics background. The other respondents, 6.2 per cent, failed to indicate their opinions. However, one teacher's response signified that home economics was not available until this year.

Courses with an occupational emphasis and offered in the home economics curriculum have been limited to girls in 51.8 per cent of the schools in this study whereas 44.4 per cent of the teachers' replies revealed that programs within their school had not been limited to

girls. Two respondents stated that in the future they did not plan to limit enrollment in such courses to girls. One teacher stated that no boys were enrolled even though the program was not limited to girls. One teacher noted that the program in her particular school situation had been limited to boys in home economics.

Of the teachers participating in this study, 70.4 per cent indicated that the factor considered most significant to the success of their occupational course was that a student have sincere interest in pursuing an occupation in the area of training after graduation. The factor considered most significant to 23.4 per cent of the teachers was that a student should have some ability and skill prior to enrolling in an occupational course. Four per cent of the respondents stated that both factors were significant for success in such courses. One teacher, 1.3 per cent noted that it had been impossible to secure enough data to arrive at a valid choice.

A question was asked concerning the type of student given primary consideration when selecting students for courses with occupational emphasis. Students with varying abilities had been considered as participants in courses with occupational emphasis. Some of the eighty-one teachers participating in this study did not make a response as to the type of students given primary consideration in selection procedures in their particular school situations. Other than ability levels of students, additional consideration in selecting students included: students who exhibit a willingness to work, follow directions, and cooperate with others, terminal students for whom it would be necessary

to obtain a job upon graduation from high school, students who show special interests and abilities in occupational work for which training is offered, and students that desire to earn money. One teacher stated that the students' attitudes and attendance records were considered in selecting students for the courses in her school.

TABLE 6

ABILITY LEVELS OF STUDENT GIVEN PRIMARY CONSIDERATION IN SELECTION PROCEDURES

Ability Level	Number
Slow learner	10
Average student	17
Above average student	0
Students with special needs	20
All of the above	30

Even though the teacher may have indicated important consideration being given to one of the listed categories, this did not necessarily mean that the majority of her students fell into such an ability level. The number of respondents indicating the approximate percentage falling into each of the listed areas is given in the following table:

TABLE 7

TYPE OF STUDENT ENROLLED AND THE PERCENTAGE OF EACH ABILITY LEVEL

Type of Student	0-10%	11-25%	26-50%	51-75%	76-100%
Slow learner	7	10	7	2	2
Average student	0	1	14	9	6
Above average student	11	8	1	1	0
Student with special needs	7	4	5	1	1

This study revealed that the most commonly recommended ages for students selected to enroll in such courses are sixteen, seventeen, and eighteen. Based on eighty-one responses, the following table presents the recommended age for students enrolled in training programs with occupational emphasis during the 1965-66 school year:

TABLE 8

NUMBER OF TEACHERS RECOMMENDING AGE LEVEL FOR STUDENTS IN HOME ECONOMICS COURSES WITH OCCUPATIONAL EMPHASIS

Recommended Age	Number
15	6
16	30
17	35
18	21
19	2
No specified age	16

A majority of the respondents, 77.8 per cent, indicated that the age level recommendation for enrolling students was satisfactory. Only 2.5 per cent of the eighty-one responses noted that the recommended age had been unsatisfactory. However, 14.8 per cent of the teachers participating in the study left this portion of the question blank. Some of the teachers, 4.9 per cent, revealed that the selection of participants in their school situation had been limited to both juniors and seniors, or to seniors only. Findings from the data indicate that it may be unsatisfactory to have a recommended age because many over-age students are in lower grades. Such students especially need encouragement to stay in school and to develop useful skills for employment. In one school situation where the recommended age had proved unsatisfactory, the teacher indicated that both sophomores and seniors were enrolled. The respondent further stated that although the sophomores benefited, it seemed difficult to challenge both grade levels due to differences in maturity.

Slightly more than half of the teachers, 50.6 per cent, indicated that it was undesirable to limit enrollment in home economics courses with occupational emphasis to high school seniors. Many of the respondents stated that it was undesirable to limit enrollment to high school seniors because many students become drop-outs before they become seniors. Evidence from comments on the questionnaire indicate that potential drop-outs need an opportunity to take advantage of such courses which prepare students for gainful employment. In some school situations, it appeared that these courses provided an opportunity to

earn money and go to school - a necessity if some students were to stay in school. Other teachers indicate that one year was not a sufficient length of time to adequately prepare high school students for job competency and suggested a second year of training as a desirable goal. Considerably less than half of the teachers participating in the study, 40.7 per cent, indicated that they considered it desirable to limit enrollment in such courses to high school seniors. However, 8.6 per cent of the respondents left this particular question unanswered.

According to information supplied by the teachers participating in this study the following percentages indicate the degree of satisfaction realized by the method of selection in use during the 1965-66 school year: (1) very satisfactory - 14.8 per cent; (2) satisfactory - 72.8 per cent; and (3) unsatisfactory - 12.3 per cent. Some of the reasons listed by the small number of respondents who indicated that the method of selecting participants for such courses had been unsatisfactory were:

1. Course development took place too rapidly for students to plan their program in anticipation of this course.

2. More time was needed to interview students and explain nature of occupational course as well as expectations for work experience.

3. Advance publicity of course was not given.

4. Enrollment was selected too quickly. Consequently, instructor did not have time to explain the program and reach students who would profit from the course.

5. Students who were not really interested in gainful employment were placed in the class.

In one school situation where the method of selection had been unsatisfactory, only 48 per cent of the students reached had special needs whereas 52 per cent of the students enrolled planned to go to college.

Major Findings

1. The largest proportion of home economics courses with occupational emphasis was offered in schools with an enrollment of over one thousand students.

Responses made by the participants provided evidence to support this finding. Nearly one-half of the programs were in schools with an enrollment of over one thousand students.

2. Student interest plays a significant role in the determination of participants for home economics courses with occupational emphasis.

Teacher responses revealed that student interest in home economics courses with occupational emphasis was the basis for selecting the majority of the participants. Interviews were used frequently as a means of selecting participants.

3. There was evidence that the home economics teacher played the most important role in encouraging student enrollment.

Of the eighty-one teachers participating in this study, sixty-three, 77.7 per cent, expressed the importance of the home economics teacher in encouraging student enrollment. The guidance counselor ranked second in encouraging student enrollment in home economics courses with occupational emphasis.

4. Few schools used any type of standardized test as a basis for selection of participants for courses with occupational emphasis.

Only twenty teachers, 24.6 per cent, indicated that applicants had been given some type of standardized test prior to selection for the program.

5. There was evidence that few schools had used a personal data sheet prior to registration as a means of obtaining information about the student.

Only twenty-six teachers, 32 per cent, indicated that some type of personal data sheet was used as a means of obtaining information about the student prior to registration.

6. Slightly less than half the schools required that consent be given by a parent or guardian for the student to enroll in courses with occupational emphasis.

About 54.3 per cent of the schools did not require that consent be given by a parent or guardian prior to enrolling in courses with occupational emphasis, while 41.9 per cent of the schools required that parental or guardian consent be given prior to enrollment.

7. There was evidence that the majority of students enrolled in home economics courses wit' occupational emphasis had previously been enrolled in home economics courses.

Only 27.4 per cent of the students enrolled in home economics courses with occupational emphasis had not had previous classes in home economics.

8. There was evidence that previous course work in home economics was considered desirable by teachers of courses with occupational emphasis.

The majority of the respondents, 86.4 per cent, indicated that it was helpful for students to have had some home economics prior to enrolling in courses with occupational emphasis.

9. There was evidence that home economics courses with occupational emphasis had been limited to girls.

A slight majority of schools, 51.8 per cent, indicated that enrollment had been limited to girls.

10. Teachers expressed that a student should possess a sincere interest in pursuing an occupation in the area of training.

Teachers, 70.4 per cent, indicated that a sincere interest in pursuing an occupation in the area of training was more important than having some ability and skill prior to enrollment.

11. There was evidence that the ability level of the student was not significant as a criterion for enrollment.

Teachers indicated that students with varying ability levels were selected as participants in programs with occupational emphasis.

12. The ages most commonly recommended for participants in courses with occupational emphasis were sixteen, seventeen, and eighteen years.

A majority of the teachers, 77.8 per cent, indicated that the recommended ages were satisfactory.

13. Teachers considered it undesirable to limit enrollment in home economics courses with occupational emphasis to high school seniors.

Forty-one teachers, 50.6 per cent, indicated that it was undesirable to limit enrollment in such courses to high school seniors, whereas

thirty-three teachers, 40.7 per cent, indicated that it was desirable to limit enrollment to high school seniors.

14. There was evidence that the method for selecting participants had been satisfactory for courses with occupational emphasis in the home economics curriculum during the 1965-66 school year.

A majority of the teachers, 87.6 per cent, indicated that their present method of selecting participants for such programs was either satisfactory or very satisfactory.

Implications

The findings were interpreted and the implications were stated with an awareness of the limitations that existed in this study. Implications resulting from this study, however, may provide a frame of reference for those who plan and evaluate home economics programs with occupational emphasis.

1. Encourage students who have a sincere interest in pursuing an occupation in the area of training to enroll in courses with an occupational emphasis.

It is advisable, probably, to select participants who will be available for employment immediately after training and instruction. There may be pertinent factors which could prevent employment, but instruction becomes effective and meaningful when it is put into practice as soon as possible.

2. If individual needs and interests were criteria for selection, knowledge concerning the home and family background of potential participants could be of value.

Adequate information that could possibly provide deeper insight into individual home and family situations is often lacking.

3. Limiting enrollment to students who had been enrolled previously in home economics courses could be one basis for selection.

A prerequisite course in home economics would be desirable. Greater depth and breadth in knowledge and kinds of learning experiences could be provided if some basic knowledge and skills had been acquired in a previous course. This could be one criteria for enrollment.

4. Boys, as well as girls, could be encouraged to enroll in home economics courses with occupational emphasis.

Knowledge and training provided in home economics courses could be beneficial for both boys and girls. Numerous employment opportunities are available to those having had training in home economics courses with occupational emphasis.

5. Further research is needed in selected aspects of programs with occupational emphasis to determine the extent to which such programs could prepare individuals for the world of work.

Selected aspects of programs with occupational emphasis need to be explored. Further study of the procedures followed in selecting participants is needed to support the findings of this study.

6. A follow-up study of the participants in home economics courses with occupational emphasis is advisable as a means of obtaining evidence of the worth of the program.

Since various methods were used to determine course participants, it would be of value to those concerned with such programs to learn the extent to which individual needs had been met.

PROGRAM ORGANIZATION FOR HOME ECONOMICS PROGRAMS WITH OCCUPATIONAL EMPHASIS

Part II

Mildred Johnson
Louise Lowe

PROGRAM ORGANIZATION FOR HOME ECONOMICS PROGRAMS WITH OCCUPATIONAL EMPHASIS

The purposes of this phase of the study were to: (1) determine the criteria currently used in organizing high school home economics programs with occupational emphasis; (2) identify the program provisions established for high school home economics programs with occupational emphasis; (3) determine the most prevalent basis for grading students enrolled in high school home economics courses with occupational emphasis; and (4) identify problems encountered in organizing high school home economics programs with occupational emphasis.

Discussion and Analysis of Data

A questionnaire was developed to obtain information concerning program organization for high school home economics programs with occupational emphasis and it was mailed to 110 home economics teachers (Appendix B).

Each teacher responded to nineteen questions concerning various aspects of program organization for high school home economics programs with occupational emphasis. These responses were considered representative of the procedures used during the 1965-66 school year. Each item on the questionnaire was analyzed descriptively.

Teachers were asked to check the methods used to determine the need for occupational courses in home economics. Frequently more than one method was used to determine that home economics courses with occupational emphasis were needed. Responses indicated that a survey of the community was the method most frequently used. (Table 1)

TABLE I

METHODS USED TO DETERMINE THE NEED FOR HOME ECONOMICS COURSES WITH OCCUPATIONAL EMPHASIS

Method	Number	Per Cent
Survey of community	67	82.7
Request of employment agencies	13	16.0
Parent requests	3	3.7
Employer requests	10	12.3
Student requests	16	19.7
Other	5	6.1
No response	5	6.1

Of the eighty-one teachers participating in this study, fifty-six, 69.1 per cent, indicated that an advisory committee was used in establishing home economics programs with occupational emphasis. The number of persons serving on the advisory committee ranged from three to forty. (Table 2) Most advisory committees consisted of four to seven members. This information is based on the responses given by fifty-five teachers.

The teachers were asked to tell or describe the manner in which advisory council members were selected. It was evident that numerous procedures were followed; the frequency with which any procedure was followed was low. Persons to serve as advisory council members were most often recommended by the superintendent of schools, the home economics teacher, and/or by businessmen where students worked. Each

TABLE 2

NUMBER OF MEMBERS THAT COMPRISE ADVISORY COMMITTEES

Number of Members	Frequency
3	2
4	10
5	12
6	8
7	8
8	3
9	2
10	3
11	1
12	4
23	1
35-40	1

of these was mentioned eight times as being the procedure followed. Most of the other recommendations for advisory council members were made by other school personnel or were selected because of the occupations or positions held in that particular community.

Forty-seven, 58 per cent, of the eighty-one home economics teachers who returned the questionnaires indicated that they had assisted in setting up the advisory council in one way or another. Twelve teachers had served on the advisory council, twleve had the entire or co-responsibility for establishing the advisory council, eight had interviewed or

contacted persons to serve in this capacity, one teacher had been an advisor to the advisory council, and six teachers did not indicate the kind of assistance given.

The types of occupation held by the advisory council members were classified as professional, non-professional, or state and city official. One hundred and thirteen members were classified as professional persons, seventy-four as non-professionals, and sixteen persons were either state or city officials.

The demands for employees with home economics knowledge and skills were ascertained. It was found that the personal interview was used most frequently to determine the demands for such employees. (Table 3) Questionnaires and employer requests were used by nearly an equal number of persons as a means of determining the need for employees with home economics knowledge and skills.

TABLE 3

METHODS USED TO DETERMINE THE DEMANDS FOR EMPLOYEES WITH HOME ECONOMICS KNOWLEDGE AND SKILLS

Method Used	Number Using the Method	Per Cent
Questionnaire	27	33.3
Personal interview	50	61.7
Employer requests	29	35.8
Help wanted ads	13	16.0
Telephone interview	15	18.5
Other; Group meetings	3	3.7

Teachers were asked to indicate who planned the suggested curriculum for the home economics program with occupational emphasis. Fifty-nine home economics teachers, 72.8 per cent, planned the home economics courses with occupational emphasis. (Table 4) Frequently more than one person or group assisted in planning the program with occupational emphasis.

TABLE 4

PERSONS INVOLVED IN PLANNING THE CURRICULUM FOR HOME ECONOMICS PROGRAMS WITH OCCUPATIONAL EMPHASIS

Persons Planning the Curriculum	Number	Per Cent
Home economics teacher	59	72.8
Home economics curriculum committee	12	14.8
Advisory council	19	23.4
State supervisor and staff	34	41.9
Other; school personnel	11	13.5

The types of provisions made for the high school home economics program with occupational emphasis which were indicated most frequently included classroom instruction, planned observations, and actual supervised work experience. This provision was made for fifty-one programs, 62.9 per cent. All the programs included classroom instruction. (Table 5)

The majority, 77.7 per cent, of the teachers checked that the student's grade was based upon classroom performance and work experience. Sixteen, 19.7 per cent, indicated that the grade was based entirely

TABLE 5

PROGRAM PROVISIONS FOR HOME ECONOMICS COURSES
WITH OCCUPATIONAL EMPHASIS

Program Provisions	Number	Per Cent
Classroom instruction	11	13.6
Classroom instruction and planned observation	15	18.5
Classroom instruction and actual supervised work experience	21	25.9
Classroom instruction, planned observations, and actual supervised work experience	51	62.9
Other	1	1.2

upon classroom performance and only one indicated that the grade was based solely upon work experience. One teacher stated that the home economics course with occupational emphasis was non-graded.

The number of units of credit given for the home economics course with occupational emphasis varied considerably. Thirty-seven teachers, 45.6 per cent, designated that one unit of credit was given for each course. According to fourteen teachers, 17.2 per cent, two units of credit were given and three teachers checked that three units of credit were earned for each home economics course with occupational emphasis. Other responses varied from "no credit," "certificate only," to eighty hours of credit for the year's program. Four and five units of credit per year were given according to five teachers; however, two other

teachers indicated that five units of credit were given for each semester's work.

Fifty-nine, 72.8 per cent, of the teachers who returned the questionnaire answered the question that related to the amount of credit given when classroom instruction and actual work experience were both part of the program. Thirty-nine teachers indicated that one credit was given for the combined classroom instruction and actual work experience when both were a part of the program. Sixteen teachers indicated that one credit was given for classroom instruction only, while four teachers designated that the credit was given for only the work experience portion of the program.

Twenty-seven teachers, 33.3 per cent, reported that provisions had been made for team teaching when the program was scheduled and that other home economics teachers were those most frequently involved. Guidance counselors, nursing instructors, business education teachers, and science teachers were also utilized in the team situation.

Inadequate facilities in the home economics department for teaching courses with occupational emphasis were cited by fifty, 61.7 per cent, of the eighty-one teachers who returned the questionnaire. Lack of equipment and space were mentioned repeatedly by the teachers. It was evident that these were the primary concerns of the teachers.

When asked if a special type of program was planned for the students enrolled in home economics programs with occupational emphasis, thirty-seven teachers responded that a special program was planned. The

special type of program that was planned related to particular occupational interests and the skills required for various occupations.

The length of time for which home economics programs with occupational emphasis were planned varied from six weeks to indefinitely. Thirty-nine, 48.1 per cent, teachers indicated that the program was planned for one year. A two-year program was planned according to fifteen respondents and seven respondents designated that the program was planned for one semester. One teacher indicated that the length of the program depended upon the individual needs of the students. Four teachers indicated the length of the program was planned in terms of the number of class hours required.

The teachers were nearly unanimous in their response to the type of program materials that were most difficult to obtain when teaching home economics courses with occupational emphasis. Texts, reference materials, and job related information was most difficult to obtain. Audio-visual aids and other kinds of illustrative materials were also designated as difficult to obtain. One teacher mentioned that obtaining sufficient funds for operating such a program was her most difficult task.

Teachers were asked to list their most difficult problems encountered in organizing the home economics program with occupational emphasis. The problems listed in order of difficulty were: (1) program planning and scheduling; (2) equipment, space, and teaching materials; (3) recruitment of students; and (4) public acceptance of programs with occupational emphasis. Some of the other problems that were mentioned once or twice included such things as teacher certification, gaining

State Department approval, integration, administrative cooperation, and work experience.

Only ten of the eighty-one teachers who returned the questionnaire indicated that no plans had been or were being made to evaluate the home economics program with occupational emphasis in their school. An occupational follow-up of the students who had been enrolled in these courses was planned by thirty schools. Thirteen schools planned to use a checklist or questionnaire for evaluation purposes. State prepared evaluation devices were to be used by seven schools and five schools planned to use some type of evaluation that was being prepared by a committee and vocational counselors. One teacher mentioned that a competency test would be used to evaluate the program.

Major Findings

1. A survey of the community was the method used by the majority of the schools as a means of determining the need for home economics programs with occupational emphasis.

Of the methods used to determine the need for a home economics program with occupational emphasis, sixty-seven, 82.7 per cent, of the teachers indicated that a survey of the community was conducted.

2. There was evidence that advisory committees consisting of from four to seven members were used to aid in establishing home economics programs with occupational emphasis.

Fifty-six teachers indicated that advisory committees were formulated to assist in establishing the programs with occupational emphasis.

Thirty-eight of these teachers responded that four to seven persons served on the advisory committee. The manner in which the members were selected to serve on advisory committees varied.

3. Home economics teachers played an important role in setting up the advisory councils.

Forty-seven, 58 per cent, of the home economics teachers assisted in setting up the advisory council. They assumed the entire or co-responsibility for establishing the council, served as a member of the council, recommended persons for the council, and interviewed or contacted persons to serve in this capacity.

4. There was evidence that personal interviews were used to ascertain the demands for employees with home economics knowledge and skills more often than other methods.

It was found that 61.7 per cent of the respondents indicated that personal interviews were used to determine the demand for employees with home economics knowledge and skills. Questionnaires and employer requests were mentioned by at least one-third of the teachers as being methods used to determine the demand for employees with home economics knowledge and skills.

5. Home economics teachers play a significant role in planning home economics programs with occupational emphasis.

Fifty-nine home economics teachers, 72.8 per cent, planned the suggested curriculum for the home economics programs with occupational emphasis. The State supervisor and staff and home economics curriculum committee were frequently involved in planning the curriculum.

6. Classroom instruction, planned observations, and actual supervised work experience were provided in more than one-half of the programs.

These provisions were utilized in fifty-one programs, 62.9 per cent. All programs included classroom instruction.

7. There was evidence that the student's grade was based upon classroom performance and work experience.

The majority of the teachers, 77.7 per cent, checked that the student's grade was based upon classroom performance and work experience. Classroom performance was the basis for grading according to sixteen teachers, 19.7 per cent.

8. The number of units of credit given for the home economics course with occupational emphasis varied from no credit to eighty hours of credit for the year's program. However, nearly one-half of the teachers reported that one unit of credit was given for each course offered.

Thirty-seven teachers, 45.6 per cent, designated that one unit of credit was given for each course. Other responses varied from "no credit," "certificate only," two, three, four, five, 45 hours credit, to eighty hours of credit for the year's program.

9. There was evidence that team teaching was not practiced to any great extent when teaching home economics programs with occupational emphasis.

Team teaching was reported by twenty-seven teachers, 33.3 per cent. Other home economics teachers were utilized most frequently in team teaching situations.

10. More than one-half of the teachers indicated that the facilities in the home economics department were inadequate for teaching courses with occupational emphasis.

Fifty teachers, 61.7 per cent, reported inadequate facilities in the home economics department for teaching courses with occupational emphasis. Lack of equipment and space were specified by the teachers.

11. Nearly one-half of the home economics programs with occupational emphasis were planned as one year programs.

Thirty-nine teachers, 48.1 per cent indicated that the home economics programs with occupational emphasis had been planned as one year programs. The length of time for programs with occupational emphasis did vary in length from six weeks to indefinitely according to the questionnaire respondents.

12. Program materials that were most difficult to obtain included texts, reference materials, and job related information.

Nearly all the teachers indicated that teaching materials, particularly texts, reference materials, and job related information were difficult to obtain. Audio visual aids and other kinds of illustrative materials were also named as being difficult to obtain for classroom use.

13. Program planning and scheduling were considered the most difficult problems encountered in organizing the home economics program with occupational emphasis.

Other problems listed in order of difficulty were: the aquisition of equipment, space, and teaching materials; recruitment of students;

and to acquire public acceptance of home economics programs with occupational emphasis.

14. The majority of teachers indicated that plans have been or were being made to evaluate the home economics programs with occupational emphasis.

Only ten teachers, 12.3 per cent, stated that no plans had been or were being made to evaluate the programs. An occupational follow-up of the students who had been enrolled in these courses was the type of evaluation designated most often.

Implications

The findings were interpreted and the implications were stated with an awareness of the limitations that existed in this study. The implications resulting from this study, however, may provide a frame of reference for those who plan and evaluate home economics programs with occupational emphasis.

1. Depending upon the number of advisory council members, it is feasible to use an advisory committee on a consultant basis to the teacher to assist with curriculum planning.

It was indicated in this study that most advisory committees consisted of from four to seven members. It is possible that this number of persons could perform their roles effectively and efficiently as advisory council members. Too many members serving on a committee can become deterrents to effective group processes.

2. If advisory council members were recommended by those with whom they would be directly related and approved by the school administrative

personnel a more representative sample of persons in the community could be secured.

Cooperative procedures could facilitate a more effective means of communication between the classroom teacher, school administration, and the community. The scope of the program with occupational emphasis could be conveyed to persons in the community in a more effective manner if a representative sample of persons engaged in various occupations within the community were selected to serve as advisory council members.

3. If classroom instruction, planned observations, and actual work experience are required for courses with occupational emphasis, it is possible that the student would be better prepared to enter the world of work.

Instruction becomes more meaningful and beneficial when theory is put into practice in actual work situations. A student's concept of work becomes more realistic after he has had an opportunity to engage in a worthwhile occupation. Such programs would provide experience with guidance and support from the teacher and employer that would enable the student to gain self-confidence.

4. If planned observation and work experience are a part of the program, time should be provided in the daily schedule so that the teacher could supervise these phases of the program.

The effectiveness of a program depends to a great extent upon the amount of time that the teacher can devote to planning and supervising the work experiences. Evaluation must be a continuous process in any program and to be performed effectively ample time must be provided.

5. It would be desirable to establish a standard for assessing the amount of credit given for a course with occupational emphasis.

Criteria that could be used in establishing uniform standards for course credit given could include the length of the program, the number of class hours, and the number of hours allotted for actual work experience. Knowing that a uniform amount of credit was awarded for courses with occupational emphasis could influence student enrollment.

6. Classroom space, equipment, and instructional materials are essential when planning home economics programs with occupational emphasis.

Adequate facilities and instructional materials can facilitate learning. Therefore, special efforts should be made by the school to provide an environment which will be conducive to learning. Teachers should be aware of the various kinds and sources of instructional materials that can best meet the needs and interests of the students.

7. Team teaching could provide breadth and depth of knowledge and experience in teaching home economics programs with occupational emphasis.

The talents and abilities of various staff members could be utilized effectively to provide more meaningful classroom experiences. Rapport must be maintained among the staff and class members and the program well defined.

8. Further research is needed to determine the effectiveness of home economics programs with occupational emphasis.

Criteria should be established for uniform evaluation of the programs. Adequate evaluation measures could strengthen the existing home economics programs with occupational emphasis and could provide a basis for development of new programs with occupational emphasis.

TEACHER SELECTION, PREPARATION, AND EXPERIENCE FOR HOME ECONOMICS PROGRAMS WITH OCCUPATIONAL EMPHASIS

Part III

Mildred Johnson
Louise Lowe

TEACHER SELECTION, PREPARATION, AND EXPERIENCE FOR HOME ECONOMICS PROGRAMS WITH OCCUPATIONAL EMPHASIS

The purposes of the third phase of the study were to: (1) determine the current practices used for the selection of teachers for high school home economics programs with occupational emphasis; (2) determine the type of preparation and practical experience that teachers had had in relation to the type of course they were teaching; (3) identify the problems encountered in teaching high school home economics courses with occupational emphasis; and (4) summarize the findings that could be of value to those concerned with teacher preparation.

Discussion and Analysis of Data

A questionnaire concerning teacher preparation and experience for home economics programs with occupational emphasis was developed and mailed to 110 home economics teachers (Appendix C). The information from the returned questionnaires provided the data upon which the analysis and discussion are based.

The eighty-one respondents answered eighteen questions concerning the type of preparation and experience they had prior to teaching a home economics course with occupational emphasis and the manner in which they were selected to teach such courses. These responses were considered representative for teachers who were teaching home economics courses with occupational emphasis during the 1965-66 school year. Each item on the questionnaire was analyzed descriptively.

The teachers were asked to indicate their educational preparation. All of the teachers, eight-one, who responded to the questionnaire

held a baccalaureate degree. Twenty-six teachers, 31.9 per cent, had earned a Masters degree. (Table I)

TABLE I

EDUCATIONAL PREPARATION OF PERSONS TEACHING HOME ECONOMICS PROGRAMS WITH OCCUPATIONAL EMPHASIS

Degree Earned	Number of Teachers	Per Cent
Bachelor of Science	50	61.7
Bachelor of Arts	5	6.1
Master of Arts	10	12.3
Master of Science	14	17.2
Master of Education	2	2.4

Teachers were asked to check the area in which their background preparation was obtained. Frequently more than one area was checked. Responses indicated that the majority of the teachers, 91.3 per cent, had background preparation in home economics education. (Table 2) Nine persons did not have background preparation in some area of home economics but in related subjects.

The majority of the teachers, 91.3 per cent, responded that they were both a homemaker and a teacher. Six teachers, 7.4 per cent, indicated that they did not have this dual responsibility. One teacher failed to respond to this question.

TABLE 2

NUMBER OF PERSONS AND AREA OF BACKGROUND PREPARATION

Area of Background Preparation	Number of Persons	Per Cent
Child development and family living	16	19.7
Foods and nutrition	20	24.7
Housing and management	12	14.8
Clothing and textiles	15	18.5
Home Economics education	74	91.3
Other	9	11.0

Teachers were asked to designate one of the five categories that included the number of years of teaching experience that they had completed. Only seven teachers indicated that they had less than one year of teaching experience. Sixty-four of the eighty-one teachers who responded to the questionnaire had more than five years of teaching experience. Twenty-eight of this number had completed sixteen years or more of teaching.

The total number of classes taught per day varied from one to six. Nearly one-half of the teachers, 49.3 per cent, taught five classes per day. (Table 3)

When the respondents were asked to check the number of courses with occupational emphasis that were taught each day, more than one-half of the teachers, 59.2 per cent, indicated that they taught one class with occupational emphasis per day. One teacher checked that

TABLE 3

NUMBER OF CLASSES TAUGHT PER DAY

Classes Per Day	Number of Teachers
1	5
2	8
3	5
4	15
5	40
6	7
7	0
No response	1

she taught five classes with occupational emphasis per day. Seventeen teachers taught two classes, ten teachers taught three classes, and three teachers indicated that they taught four classes with occupational emphasis per day. Two teachers failed to respond to this question.

The average number of students per class in home economics ranged from ten to thirty-two students. Ten teachers listed the average class size to be twenty students. (Table 4) Twenty-five students was the average class size according to eight teachers. Only one teacher indicated that the average class size was thirty-two.

The average number of students per home economics course with occupational emphasis varied from four to twenty-seven students. Fifteen students per class was indicated most often as the average

TABLE 4

AVERAGE NUMBER OF STUDENTS PER HOME ECONOMICS CLASS

Average Class Size	Responses
10	1
11	2
12	6
13	4
15	6
16	5
17	3
18	7
19	2
20	10
22	3
23	1
24	7
25	8
26	1
27	4
28	5
30	2
32	1

class size. Eighteen, twelve, and eight students per class were indicated as average class size in order of frequency.

Teachers were asked to check the type of home economics course with occupational emphasis that was being taught during the 1965-1966 school year. Forty-six courses, 56.7 per cent, emphasized food service and food preparation. Thirty courses, 36.9 per cent, related to clothing maintenance and construction, fifteen courses, 28.5 per cent, were to prepare housekeeper or homemaker's aids, fifteen courses in the area of child care, seven courses emphasized nursing skills, and other courses were related or involved home economics skills and knowledge.

Numerous titles were given to the home economics courses with occupational emphasis, however, the titles were directly related to the type of occupation such as food service and preparation, clothing maintenance and construction, housekeeper, homemaker's aides, child care and others. There were some teachers who indicated that the course was entitled, "Occupational Training," which was used to encompass any and all areas of home economics.

Sixty teachers, 74 per cent, indicated that they had engaged in some type of practical work experience other than teaching. Thirty-six of the teachers, 44.4 per cent, engaged in practical work experience other than teaching that related directly to the occupational courses that they were teaching. Some teachers had engaged in work experiences that did not relate to the course they were teaching. Thirty-six teachers had worked in food service and preparation capacities. Clerical work had been the type of work experience for twenty-one teachers. Some of the other work experiences listed by the respondents included elavator operator, industrial inspector, business administration, music teacher, housekeeper, and others.

In relation to selection of personnel for teaching occupational courses, thirty-four teachers, 40.9 per cent, indicated that the state supervisor of home economics and area supervisors were responsible for their being selected. The principal or superintendent was responsible for selecting fourty-four, 54.5 per cent, of the teachers who taught the courses with occupational emphasis. Nineteen teachers, 23.4 per cent, volunteered, and fifteen teachers were selected by the chairman of the home economics department to teach the home economics courses with occupational emphasis. The basis of recommendation for three of the teachers was not identified.

Only twenty-six, 32 per cent, of the eighty-one teachers who responded to the questionnaire considered their pre-service background to be inadequate for teaching courses with occupational emphasis. One-half of the teachers who considered their background inadequate stated that they had insufficient educational preparation for teaching the courses. Some teachers indicated a lack of teaching experience and practical experience.

When the teachers were asked what they considered most beneficial for a teacher of courses with occupational emphasis, 77.7 per cent of the teachers designated that educational training at the pre-service and in-service level and practical work experience would be the most beneficial. Practical work experience in an area related to the type of course being taught was listed as second in importance. However, it should be noted that practical work experience in a related area was mentioned by only 12.3 per cent of the teachers.

Seventy-two teachers, 88.8 per cent, responded that workshops or in-service training for teaching courses with occupational emphasis were conducted in their state. State supervisors were responsible for conducting nearly one-half, 48.1 per cent, of the workshops or in-service training programs. The state supervisors and state universities cooperated in planning twenty-four, 29.1 per cent, of the workshops or programs. Sixteen state universities assumed full responsibility for providing workshops and in-service training programs. Local advisory councils and school principals were responsible for three training programs. Nine teachers did not respond to the question.

Contributions that courses with occupational emphasis can make to the education of youth were listed by the respondents. Twenty-eight teachers, 34.5 per cent, stated that the greatest contribution that courses with occupational emphasis could make was to prepare students for gainful and meaningful employment. Sixteen teachers, 19.7 per cent, stressed that this type of program helped to develop the student's sense of personal worth. Other contributions that courses with occupational emphasis make toward the education of youth included were to train potential drop-outs, practical experience, meet needs of the community, promote personal economy, develop responsibility and interest in occupations.

Teachers were asked to list three of the most difficult problems that they encountered in teaching home economics courses with occupational emphasis. Problems cited by the teachers were numerous. Teaching without sufficient materials, texts, and visual aids was

considered to be the most difficult problem encountered by the teachers who responded to the questionnaire. Other difficult problems cited in order of frequency were: (1) lack of work centers for placement of students and scheduling; (2) poor student attitude and response and insufficient time for supervision; (3) time and ways to recruit students, unreliable students, and lack of space and equipment. Other problems were listed less frequently.

Sixty-five, 80.2 per cent, of the teachers indicated that they planned to continue teaching courses with occupational emphasis during the following year. Fifteen teachers, 18.5 per cent, stated that they did not intend to teach a course with occupational emphasis during the following school year. Of this number, five teachers were changing positions, two teachers would assume the responsibility for planning the programs but would not teach them, one teacher was leaving the teaching field, and two teachers gave no indication of why they were not continuing to teach a course with occupational emphasis. Five negative replies were due to: program being removed from the curriculum, lack of available work experience centers, insufficient enrollment, and community rejection. One teacher did not complete this question.

Major Findings

1. All of the persons who taught home economics courses with occupational emphasis possessed a baccalaureate degree.

Of the eighty-one teachers who participated in this study, all had completed baccalaureate degrees. Twenty-six of this number had also earned a Master's degree.

2. There was evidence that the majority of the teachers who were teaching home economics courses with occupational emphasis had background preparation in the area of home economics education.

Seventy-four teachers, 91.3 per cent, had background preparation in home economics. Some teachers indicated more than one area of preparation.

3. The majority of the teachers had completed at least five years of teaching experience and combined the roles of homemaker and teacher.

Twenty-eight teachers in this study had completed sixteen years or more of teaching. Only seven teachers indicated less than one year of teaching experience.

4. The majority of the respondents taught four or five home economics classes per day; more than one-half of the respondents taught one class with occupational emphasis per day.

Nearly one-half of the teachers, 49.3 per cent, taught five home economics classes per day and fifteen teachers, 18.5 per cent, taught four classes per day. It was found that 59.2 per cent of the teachers taught one class with occupational emphasis per day.

5. The average size for home economics classes was twenty and the average class size for classes with occupational emphasis was fifteen.

Class size for home economics classes ranged from ten to thirty-two and the class size for classes with occupational emphasis ranged from four to twenty-seven.

6. More than one-half of the courses with occupational emphasis that were taught during the 1965-1966 school year were in food service and food preparation.

Forty-six courses emphasized food service and food preparation, thirty courses related to clothing maintenance and construction, fifteen courses in child care, and fifteen courses emphasized housekeeper or homemaker's aides knowledge and skills.

7. Nearly three-fourths of the home economics teachers had experience other than teaching; thirty-six of this number had engaged in practical work experience that related directly to the occupational courses that they were teaching.

Slightly less than one-half of the teachers who had engaged in practical work experience had worked in food service and preparation capacities.

8. The school principal or superintendent was responsible for determining or selecting more than one-half of the home economics teachers to teach courses with occupational emphasis.

The state supervisor of home economics and area supervisors were responsible for selecting 40.9 per cent of the teachers. Only nineteen teachers volunteered to teach courses with occupational emphasis.

9. There was evidence that the majority of the teachers considered their pre-service background adequate for teaching courses with occupational emphasis.

Only twenty-six teachers, 32 per cent, considered their pre-service background to be inadequate for their teaching responsibilities.

insufficient educational preparation for teaching the course, lack of teaching experience, and lack of practical experience were cited as pre-service background inadequacies.

10. Educational training at the pre-service level, in-service level, and practical work experience were considered most beneficial for the teacher of courses with occupational emphasis.

According to 77.7 per cent of the teachers who responded to the questionnaire, educational training at the pre-service level, in-service level, and practical work experience were the most beneficial for teachers. Practical work experience in a related area was listed as second in importance by 12.3 per cent of the teachers.

11. The majority of states conducted workshops or in-service training programs for teachers of home economics courses with occupational emphasis.

Workshops were conducted by 88.8 per cent of the states represented in this study. Nearly one-half of the workshops or in-service training programs were conducted by the state supervisors and 29.1 per cent of the workshops or in-service training programs were offered through the cooperative efforts of the state supervisors and state universities.

12. To prepare students for gainful and meaningful employment was considered the greatest contribution that courses with occupational emphasis afforded.

The above contribution was cited by 34.5 per cent of the teachers. The second highest contribution cited by 19.7 per cent of the teachers was that this type of program helped to develop the student's sense of

personal worth. Other contributions related to preparation for gainful and meaningful employment and develop the student's sense of personal worth.

13. Lack of teaching materials, texts, and visual aids presented the most difficult problem for teachers of courses with occupational emphasis.

Lack of work centers for placement of students and scheduling students for the course with occupational emphasis were both cited an equal number of times as being the second most difficult problem. Poor student attitude and response and insufficient time for supervision of work experience were both cited an equal number of times as being the third most difficult problem.

14. The majority of the teachers indicated that they planned to continue teaching courses with occupational emphasis.

Only fifteen teachers stated that they did not intend to teach such a course during the following school year. Changing positions, assuming other responsibilities, and leaving the teaching field were some of the reasons for not continuing.

Implications

The findings were interpreted and the implications were stated with an awareness of the limitations that existed in this study. The implications resulting from this study, however, may provide a frame of reference for teacher educators and state supervisors who are responsible for planning and providing teacher education programs

at the pre-service and in-service levels, and for those who must assume the responsibility for selecting teachers to instruct home economics classes with occupational emphasis.

1. Since practical work experience that is directly related to courses taught is highly desirabie, consideration should be given to making work experience an integral part of the home economics program.

The practical work experience could become a valuable and essential part of a person's training if it were carefully planned, supervised, and coordinated. Scheduling such a work experience could present problems.

2. If a five year cooperative program of home economics education and coordinated home economics related employment for pay were offered, competencies in areas of specialization, breadth and depth of practical and theoretical knowledge that will enable an individual to meet his responsibility as a teacher or in other types of employment could be realized.

A cooperative program of education and employment becomes a source of motivation and encouragement when pay is offered for services rendered. This would make it possible for some persons to continue their education who would otherwise not be able to do so.

3. Internship programs could provide persons with occupational experience the opportunity to apply knowledge to professional problems.

Persons selected for internship programs should be designed specifically for the person with occupational experience. Internship programs provide practical training under the guidance of competent

teachers. An individual's interest and ability in the teaching profession could be tested during the internship program.

4. Teachers who have the responsibility of supervising student work experiences should be allotted sufficient time for supervision in her daily schedule.

Supervising students engaged in work experiences as a part of a course taught with occupational emphasis is time consuming. This must be considered when the class schedules are planned and the teaching assignments given. A block of time during the day would be desirable for planning, supervising, and coordinating the work experience with the classroom instruction.

5. If job-training centers are identified when programs with occupational emphasis are planned, students could be assigned to centers for work experience where competence could be developed.

The problem encountered by many teachers has been that of finding work centers where students could be placed. This facet of the program should be investigated when the program is planned. Work must be available in the area for which students are trained otherwise the interest declines and the program can become ineffective.

6. Further research is needed to determine the effectiveness of various kinds of programs that are established to train persons at the pre- and in-service levels to teach courses with occupational emphasis.

Training is essential, therefore, various kinds of programs should be explored. Programs must be developed to meet the rapidly increasing and changing demands of society.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

SELECTION OF PARTICIPANTS

You have been selected to participate in a nation-wide study conducted by the School of Home Economics at the University of North Carolina--Greensboro. This study is concerned with three phases of the occupational programs in home economics at the high school level:

teacher preparation and experience

program organization

selection of participants

Please complete the following questionnaire. Directions for the questions will vary, either check each item that most nearly represents you or your situation or list the information requested. Any materials that you have developed and will share with us will be appreciated.

Name: _____

School address: _____

State: _____

Type of school: _____

____ Urban ____ Rural ____ Other, please indicate

Size of school:

____ Less than 150

____ 150 to 300

____ 300 to 500

____ 500 to 1000

____ 1000 to 1500

____ Over 1500

Selection of Participants

1. What method was used in selecting students for occupational training programs in your school?

____ Interview
____ Interest
____ Registration
____ Tests
____ Recommendations

If other methods were used, please list.

2. If an interview were used in your school, who comprised the interview committee?

____ Principal
____ Guidance counselor
____ Dean of girls
____ Home economics teacher
____ Homeroom teacher
____ State supervisor

If others, please list.

3. Who played the primary role in encouraging students to enroll in occupational training programs in your school?

____ The State supervisor
____ The principal
____ The guidance counselor
____ The home economics teacher

If others, please list.

4. What background information about the student have you found useful?

____ Family background
____ Academic
____ Ratings of personal traits
____ Interests and aptitudes
____ Standardized test scores

Star the information you had available prior to the time the student enrolled in your class.

5. Were the applicants given a standardized test (tests) before being accepted in an occupational training program?

____ I. Q.
____ Vocational interest
____ Aptitude

If others, please list.

Did the test given prove satisfactory? ____ Yes ____ No

Please give name of test.

6. Was any type of personal data sheet used prior to registration to secure helpful information about the qualifications of the student?
____ Yes ____ No

If so, please indicate the most important items included or you like to mail a copy.

7. Was the consent of a parent or guardian required before the applicant was accepted for the program? ____ Yes ____ No

If consent was required, please mail a copy of the form.

8. How many of your students now enrolled in occupational courses have had:

____ no home economics
____ 1 semester of home economics
____ 1 year of home economics
____ 2 years of home economics
____ 2 or more years of home economics

Do you consider it helpful for students to have had some home economics prior to enrolling in occupational courses?
____ Yes ____ No

9. Has the program been limited to girls? ____ Yes ____ No

10. Check the one you consider to be most significant to the success of occupational courses:

____a. A student have some abilities and skills prior to enrolling in an occupational course
____b. A student have sincere interest in pursuing an occupation in this area after graduation.

11. In selecting students, is primary consideration given to:

____ the slow learner
____ the average student
____ the above average student
____ students with special needs
____ all of the above

If others, please specify

At the right of each of the above, estimate approximately the percentage of students falling into each category.

12. The recommended age for students enrolled in occupational training programs in your school:

___15 ___16 ___17 ___18 ___19 ___No specified age

Has the recommended age level been: ___Satisfactory ___Unsatisfactory

If unsatisfactory, please give a reason:

13. Do you consider it ___desirable ___undesirable to limit enrollment to high school seniors?

If undesirable, please give a reason:

14. Has the method of selecting participants this school year been:

____ Very satisfactory
____ Satisfactory
____ Unsatisfactory

If unsatisfactory, in what respects.

APPENDIX B

TEACHER PREPARATION AND EXPERIENCE

Teacher Preparation and Experience

1. Educational preparation: _____
   degree(s) earned, name of institutions(s).

   _____

2. Check the area in which your background preparation was obtained:

   ___Child Development
   ___Foods and Nutrition
   ___Housing and Management
   ___Clothing and Textiles
   ___Home Economics Education
   ___Other; please list

3. Are you both a homemaker and a teacher? ___Yes ___No

4. Years of teaching experience in home economics:

   ___0-1 ___1-4 ___5-9 ___10-15 ___16 and over

5. Total number of classes taught per day:

   ___1 ___2 ___3 ___4 ___5 ___6 ___7

6. Number of occupational training classes per day:

   ___1 ___2 ___3 ___4 ___5 ___6 ___7

7. What is the average number of students per class in home economics in your school? _____

8. What is the average number of students per occupational course in your school? _____

9. What type of occupational course(s) are you presently teaching?

   ___Food Service
   ___Food Preparation
   ___Clothing Maintenance
   ___Clothing Construction
   ___Housekeeper
   ___Homemaker's Aide
   ___Child care
   ___Other, please list

10. What is the title(s) of the course offering(s)? _____

    _____

11. Have you had practical work experience other than teaching?
    ___Yes ___No If yes, please list work experience.

12. How were you selected to teach the occupational course(s) in home economics?

____by the principal
____by the superintendent
____by the chairman of Home Economics dept.
____by the state supervisor of Home Economics
____volunteered
____other; please list

13. Did your pre-service background adequately prepare you for teaching occupational course?

____Yes ____No If not, please give reasons.

14. What do you consider most beneficial for the teacher of occupational courses?

____educational training at the pre-service level
____educational training at the in-service level
____practical work experience in related area
____educational training at the pre-service level and practical work experience
____educational training at the in-service level and practical work experience
____educational training at the pre-service level, in-service level and practical work experience.
____Other; please indicate

15. If workshops or in-service training programs were held in your state, who were responsible for them?

____state universitites
____state supervisors
____local advisory councils
____state universities and state supervisors
____other; please indicate type of training program and by whom

16. If it is assumed that occupational courses have and can contribute to the education of youth, what do you believe to be the greatest contribution?

17. List three of the most difficult problems that you have encountered in teaching courses for gainful employment.

18. Do you plan to continue teaching occupational courses in home economics next year?

___Yes ___No If not, please give reasons

APPENDIX C

PROGRAM ORGANIZATION

Program Organization

1. How were the needs for an occupational course in home economics determined?

___survey of community
___request of employment agencies
___parent requests
___employer requests
___student requests
___Other, please list

2. Was an advisory committee used in establishing occupational courses in the home economics curriculum?
___Yes ___No

3. How many members were on the advisory committee?

___1
___2
___3
___4
___5
___6
___7
___If more, indicate the number

4. How were the advisory council members selected?

5. Did you, as a home economics teacher, have any part in setting up the advisory council?

___Yes ___No If yes, in what way?

6. What types of occupations were represented on the advisory council?

7. How were the demands for employees with home economics knowledge and skills determined?

___questionnaire
___personal interview
___employer requests
___help wanted ads
___telephone interviews
___Other; please indicate

8. Who planned the suggested curriculum for the occupational course?

___home economics teacher
___home economic curriculum committee
___advisory council
___state supervisor and staff
___Other; please indicate

9. Does the program provide for:

___classroom instruction
___classroom instruction and planned observation
___classroom instruction and actual supervised work experience
___classroom instruction, planned observations, and actual supervised work experience
___Other; please indicate

10. Is the student's grade based upon:

____classroom performance
____classroom performance and work experience
____work experience
____other; please indicate

11. How many units of credit are given for the occupational course?

___1 ___2 ___3 ___Other; please indicate

12. If classroom instruction and actual work experience are both part of the program, does the student receive one credit for:

____classroom performance
____classroom performance and work experience
____work experience
____other; please indicate

13. Was provision made in scheduling for team teaching? ___Yes ___No
If yes, check the area(s).

____English
____Business Education
____Social Studies
____Guidance counselors
____Math
____Speech
____Other home economics teachers
____Other; please indicate

14. Were the facilities in the home economics department adequate for the occupational course(s) taught?

___Yes ___No If not, please indicate inadequacies

15. Was a special type of program planned for the student's enrolled in occupational course(s)?

___Yes ___No If yes, please indicate the type of program.

16. Was the program planned for:

____one semester
____one year
____two years
____Other; please indicate

17. What type of program materials were most difficult to obtain?

18. In organizing the occupational program, what were the most difficult problems? Please list in order of difficulty.

19. What plans have been or are being made to evaluate the occupational program in your school.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. BOOKS

Hatcher, Hazel M. and Andrews, Mildred D. The Teaching of Home Economics. New York: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1963.

Spafford, Ivol. A Functioning Program of Home Economics. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1940.

Spafford, Ivol. Fundamentals in Teaching Home Economics. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1942.

Thurston, Lee M. and Roe, William H. State School Administration. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1957.

Williamson, Maude and Lyle, Mary Stewart. Homemaking Education in the High School. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1961.

B. PERIODICALS

Buchanan, Elsie. "Education for Gainful Employment in Occupations Related to Home Economics." Illinois Teacher of Home Economics, VIII, No. 3, 97-106.

Capps, Gertrude S. "Home Economics - Oriented World of Work Programs - The Current Detroit Scene." Illinois Teacher of Home Economics, VIII, No. 4, 179-186.

Dennis, Catherine T. "Re-examination of the Purposes of Home Economics at the Secondary Level." Illinois Teacher of Home Economics, VIII, No. 2, 3-12.

Goodwin, Robert. "Preparing Children and Youth for Work: The School's Role." Educational Leadership, XXII (January, 1965), 219-220, 287-288.

Hurt, Mary Lee. "Education for the World of Work - A Team Approach." Educational Leadership, XXII (January, 1965), 221-225.

Reinwald, Clio. "Education for Employment." Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals, XLVIII (December, 1964), 28-37

Schnell, Dorothy M. and Mills, Jane Y. "Education for Gainful Occupations Related to Home Economics in California." Illinois Teacher of Home Economics, VIII, No. 4, 156-172.

Simpson, Elizabeth Jane. "The Present Challenge in Curriculum Development in Home Economics." Illinois Teacher of Home Economics, IX, No. 1, 1-21.

Simpson, Elizabeth Jane. "The Vocational Purpose of Home Economics Education - With Focus on Education for Employment." Illinois Teacher of Home Economics, VIII, No. 2, 87-93.

True, Marcia R. and Downs, Helen. "Work-Study Home Economics Program at Auburn, Maine." Illinois Teacher of Home Economics, VIII, No. 4, 223-226.

Whitmarsh, Ruth. "Opinion of City Home Economics Supervisors on the Employment Emphasis in Home Economics Education at the Secondary Level." Illinois Teacher of Home Economics, VII, No. 6, 59-66.

C. PUBLIC DOCUMENTS

U. S. Congress, Senate, Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. Selected Education Acts of 1963. 88th Congress, 1st seas., 1963.

D. CONFERENCE REPORTS

Horn, Rua Van. Conference Report: Contemporary Issues in Home Economics. "Home Economics Education--Homemaking and Employment at the Post High School Level." University of Illinois: May, 1965.

United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Summary Report of the Panel of Consultants on Vocational Education. "Education for a Changing World of Work." Washington, D. C. Government Printing Office, 1962.

E. UNPUBLISHED MATERIAL

Johnson, Mildred B. "A Wage-Earning Oriented Experimental Program in High School Home Economics." Unpublished Doctoral Thesis, University of Wisconsin, 1965.